Republican women are outnumbered in Congress.

Right
the ratio
Female GOP leaders are outnumbered, outpaced, and out of office.

The numbers reflect the ratio of Democratic to Republican women in Congress.

Of America’s 104 congresswomen, 76 are Democrats, 28 are Republicans.
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“We would benefit by having more women in office, especially in the legislature at the state and federal levels, for the different perspectives they bring.... If they’re as qualified or more qualified, we should be promoting women.”

Female Republican state party leader
Women are inching toward gender parity in Congress, but the gains are lopsided. The vast majority of congresswomen are Democrats; they outnumber Republicans three to one.

At one point, the breakdown was fairly equal. During President Ronald Reagan’s second term, 25 women served in Congress; 13 Republicans and 12 Democrats. Today, there are 104 congresswomen: 76 Democrats and just 28 Republicans. Democratic women have increased their numbers six-fold since the 1980s. Female Republicans have barely doubled their standings.

Our research reveals that the primary issue for Republican women is the primary itself. While many factors affect the emergence and success of female candidates, in the race to high-level office, GOP women face higher hurdles, specifically: Infrastructure, Inattention, and Ideology. No single factor is make or break, but together they dramatically hinder Republican women’s chances for electoral success.

Female GOP candidates are far less likely to enter or win a primary election than their Democratic peers. Those who do run are often stuck in the starting block without adequate coaching and support. In contrast to female Democratic candidates, Republican women don’t benefit from a “gender advantage,” leaving them outnumbered, outpaced, and out of office.
“The mounting issues facing our country are complex. If we’re going to solve these problems, we can no longer afford to leave the talent of half our nation out of the conversation.”

Kerry Healey
Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, 2003-2006
Nearly a century after suffrage, women are not yet one-fifth of the governing body that’s meant to represent their views and interests – even as they account for more than 50 percent of the population.
Women as Percentage of Partisan Caucuses in US House over Time

Source: CAWP data

VIEWED OVER A LONGER TIME SPAN, THE TREND IS EVEN MORE PRONOUNCED.
Our research reveals that the primary issue for Republican women is the primary itself. Democratic women are more likely to run and far more likely to win their primaries than Republican women. 

In the 2014 midterms, 249 women filed as primary candidates for House seats – 154 Democrats (62 percent) and 95 Republicans (38 percent). Of these, 159 became general election nominees with an even greater partisan split (69 percent Democrats). Of all female general election candidates, 84 were elected to the House – 62 Democrats and just 22 Republicans.

In contrast to the 2012 Senatorial elections, when female Democratic candidates outnumbered Republican women 2 to 1 (20 D and 12 R), candidates of both parties ran in near equal numbers in the 2014 Senate primary – 15 Democrats and 16 Republicans. Yet in the 2014 elections, women as a whole were generally less successful than in 2012. Of the total 31 female candidates for Senate in 2014, fewer than half (48 percent) won their party’s nomination. (In 2012, the success rate was 60 percent.)

The 2014 results are also notable for the discrepancy between primary and general win rates for women in both parties. Female Democratic Senate candidates outperformed GOP women in the primary, and were twice as likely to become their party’s nominee – 66 percent of Democratic women won their primaries, compared with 31 percent of Republican women. In stark contrast to prior election cycles, however, female GOP candidates fared significantly better in the general election. Of the five female Republican nominees, three (60 percent) won the general election. On the Democratic side, however, only one of 10 (10 percent) female nominees won the general election.

Of the total 31 female candidates for Senate in 2014, fewer than half (48 percent) won their party’s nomination.

1 See also CAWP work on primaries: www.cawp.rutgers.edu/research/documents/Primary-Problems-10-1-13.pdf
Democratic women run more often than female Republicans and are more likely to win their primaries. Based on the last two election cycles, they are also more likely, once nominated, to win the general election. The party gap, however, is starkest during the primary.

The lack of primary wins for female Republican candidates may be caused in part by – and is certainly exacerbated by – their relative lack of incumbency status. Incumbency for all types of candidates is usually the major determinant of winning. Incumbents generally win reelection at a rate of 90 percent or more. For GOP women, however, the lack of incumbency status becomes a vicious cycle. With few female Republican incumbents, and with existing officeholders (mostly long-serving men) very likely to win reelection, Republican women remain stuck in the starting blocks.

Improving our political system requires greater female representation on both sides of the aisle, as well as legislative bodies that reflect the true diversity of our country. More women continue to identify as Democrats than Republicans in the general population. But these differences in party identification are nowhere near the extreme disparity in female elected officials in high-level office. More women also identify as independent than as Republican, suggesting opportunity for the GOP to pick up new voters and seats. More than one-third of women identify as independents.
In this report, we explore the hurdles Republican women face in the primary and consider what it will take to:

- Clear these hurdles
- Help female candidates be more prepared for primary and general elections
- Increase women’s leadership in the highest levels of political office

Sources: Pew 2012 Values Survey, CAWP data
“Our primaries have become a massive litmus test. It’s a barrier for women. **We have to do a better job of helping women** be more viable in primaries.”

*Male Republican national party leader*
Harnessing Findings from Multiple Projects

We explored four central sets of questions related to what we hypothesized could be hurdles for female candidates in Republican primaries.

KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. **CANDIDATE EMERGENCE**: How is the Republican Party recruiting women? Is there a difference between recruiting candidates for federal and state office?

2. **CANDIDATE QUALITY**: Do female Republican candidates enter their primary with different qualifications than male Republican or female Democratic candidates?

3. **CANDIDATE AND VOTER IDEOLOGY**: Republican primary voters are often more conservative (and tend to be more white and male) than the Republican electorate in general. How do the demographics and ideological positions of the primary electorate, as well as changes in party ideology, affect female Republican primary candidates?

4. **FUNDRAISING AND CANDIDATE SUPPORT**: Do Republican donors give as much to female candidates as to male candidates? Do Republican women receive the same financial support as Democratic women candidates in a primary? Do independent expenditures (PACs, 501(c)(4)s, 527s) help or hinder female Republican primary candidates?
RESEARCH TEAM

We assembled esteemed researchers to investigate these questions through original data and analyses, including:

Nicole McCleskey (Public Opinion Strategies/POS) conducted a series of one-on-one in-depth interviews with 10 party leaders (five at the state level and five at the national level) and four Republican congresswomen. A party leader is involved in senior leadership with a national committee and/or state committee. POS focused on Arizona, Indiana, and Washington State as states with more active programs for women candidates. Interviews were conducted from March 25-April 21, 2014. POS also ran two 400-person national surveys – one of Republican primary voters and one of independent/swing voters – to ascertain what voters look for in a female candidate, issues of importance, and perceptions of women candidates.

Bob Carpenter (Chesapeake Beach Consulting, formerly of American Viewpoint), with the assistance of Celinda Lake and her team at Lake Research (experts in women’s candidacies), and Nancy Bocskor of The Nancy Bocskor Company (a professional fundraiser for GOP candidates), conducted interviews, case studies, and database construction/analysis assessing questions about fundraising, party support and recruitment, and who decides not to run. The team explored how professional Republican fundraisers support female candidates; the profiles of female Democratic candidates and female Republican candidates in the 2014 cycle; and why certain high-profile Republican women decided not to pursue public office in the past few years. Mr. Carpenter and Ms. Lake also served as general consultants to Ms. McCleskey’s POS team on the national surveys.

Dr. Kelly Dittmar (Center for American Women & Politics at Rutgers/CAWP), with assistance from Sarah Bryner at the Center for Responsive Politics, collected and analyzed financial contribution data from the last four election cycles, comparing men to women both within and across parties. Dr. Kira Sanbonmatsu of CAWP also served as a general adviser and consultant on the project, particularly regarding methodologies and instruments.

Dr. Rosalyn Cooperman (University of Mary Washington) and Dr. Melody Crowder-Meyer (Sewanee: University of the South) conducted a national survey (“The 2014 National Supporters Survey”) of donors to women’s PACs on both sides of the aisle, as well as party donors. They sought to understand the demographics of women’s PAC donors and their reasons for contributing, as well as their similarities and differences with those who donate to the parties.

Dr. Danielle Thomsen (Duke University) and her team produced a dataset of candidates for Congress over the past twenty years, coded by gender, party, and political ideology (liberal/conservative score), and whether each candidate won or lost his/her race. This dataset and Dr. Thomsen’s analysis allowed us to test hypotheses about the ideological shifts within each party and the connection between ideology and a primary and/or general election loss or win.

Political Parity, under the leadership of Research Fellow Shauna Shames, played a guiding role throughout the research process. During the data collection and analysis phases, regular calls were conducted to solicit input on research instruments, share early findings, and identify trends across teams. Dr. Shames compiled, organized, and refined analysis to establish common narrative themes, ensuring that this report reflects and clearly articulates the full breadth of work that underpins it.
In Georgia’s Republican Senate primary, Karen Handel competed in a crowded field of seven Republican hopefuls, including three current congressmen. Handel, a former Senior Vice President of Komen and former Georgia Secretary of State, co-chaired the Republican State Legislative Committee’s “Right Women, Right Now” initiative to elect more women to state legislatures. The Georgia primary was closely watched as Republicans tried to find the best candidate to beat Democratic challenger Michelle Nunn. Handel seemed to have an edge, as it was difficult to allege sexism in a woman-to-woman race. Handel said at a public event, “I would really love to see Michelle Nunn drop the war on women on me.” Yet she continued to trail her in the polls.

Despite her conservative background (she is staunchly pro-life), the endorsement and active campaign support by Sarah Palin, and last minute support by the American Future Fund, she fell short and lost the primary, coming in third behind David Perdue (former Dollar General CEO and cousin of former Governor Sonny Perdue) and Representative Jack Kingston. Handel was significantly outspent by both in the primary. The April quarterly report shows that she only raised $295,682 compared to Perdue’s $823,563 and Kingston’s $1,094,210— not nearly enough to be competitive in a hotly contested primary. Further, the caliber and prior experience of her opponents meant that all had extensive networks they could tap for donations and support. Handel stumbled against one of the most important hurdles in political campaigns: the ability to access an existing network of donors and raise enough money to be competitive.

**HIGHER HURDLE #1**

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

Running for office is no small feat. Every candidate, even incumbents, works hard to win elections. The costs involved—financial, but also time and effort— are staggering, and grow with each passing cycle. For various reasons, however, the costs are higher for women than for men. Our research finds that although all women encounter obstacles, Republican women face higher hurdles, particularly in the primary election.

Our research affirms that female Republican candidates have greater difficulty raising money than their Democratic counterparts, mainly because of fragmented sources of support. This hurdle becomes only harder to scale as the costs of running a political campaign rise (currently about $1.5 million for a House seat and $10.4 million for the Senate) and women have less access to big money. As illustrated below, female Democratic candidates have had demonstrably more success fundraising than their female Republican counterparts.

---

House Candidate Outcomes: Electoral and Financial (2014 Averages)

- Percentage of candidates
- Raised at least $80,000 in Q2
- Won primary
- Raised at least $100 from Party
- Raised at least $10,000 from PACs
- Endorsed by EMILY'S List

Source: Parity Data Collection from FEC reports and other public sources.

THE SAME PATTERN APPEARS WHEN COMPARING THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY RAISED BY DEMOCRATIC VERSUS REPUBLICAN FEMALE CANDIDATES IN 2014

Financial Data: Average Funds Raised per Candidate

Source: Parity Data Collection from FEC reports and other public sources.
Q1 and Q2 refer to the first and second quarter filing deadlines. Amounts shown are direct receipts raised only in that quarter. Data includes incumbents.
Because political parties are hesitant to get involved in primary elections, a significant percentage of campaign funds come from PACs. In 2014, Super PACs reported total receipts of nearly $700 million and total independent expenditures of nearly $300 million. 4

Our analysis of data from the Federal Election Commission and the Center for Responsive Politics does not show major differences in receipts of party money by women versus men within parties. By the end of Q2 filings for 2014, candidates in general received little direct party money. Non-party money, however, is not readily available for Republican women; in many cases, they don’t receive PAC money until they become the party nominee. This presents a paradox: without money, female GOP candidates struggle to win their primaries, but they generally don’t receive much party money until they do.

Source: OpenSecrets.org: https://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/superpacs.php
MYTH VS REALITY

Conventional wisdom holds that female candidates can’t raise as much money as male candidates. Our qualitative and quantitative data disputes this misconception. Experienced fundraisers confirm that donors don’t differentiate on gender. The most important factors for a donor are electability, credibility, and ideology. As our chart above shows, in fundraising, incumbency plays a far greater role than gender.

Claims that women must work harder than men to fundraise similar amounts may intimidate women from running (see Parity’s “Shifting Gears” report), particularly Republican women, who lack the support of an organized funding infrastructure. Female candidates, however, do raise just as much as men in comparable races, even if they have to work harder than male candidates to raise the same amount.

A candidate’s most important tool is a strong donor list. Female candidates often start at a disadvantage because they don’t have an established fundraising list, while men typically have more contacts. Experienced fundraisers note that female candidates can quickly learn the process and improve their skills. In fact, they suggest that in certain cases, such as knowing when to push a donor and when to back off, women have an edge.
Earnest attempts are underway to elect more Republican women, but support is fragmented. Every Republican committee has a program, and there are a number of PACs and other entities addressing the issue. Yet, many GOP leaders we interviewed are worried progress will stall without greater collaboration and cohesive direction.

“…You have NFRW, VIEW PAC, Maggie’s List. I’m concerned there’s not a truly coordinated effort.”

Republican congresswoman

Female elected leaders are adamant that more can and should be done to promote women, including greater party involvement in primary elections, which some say has been taboo at the national committees.

“When we have a quality leader running, there needs to be a commitment to get her through the primary. We’ve always adopted a hands off approach to primaries. That changed in 2014…there’s a growing recognition that we can’t sit out primaries.”

Republican congresswoman

CASE STUDY
Barbara Comstock (Congress, Virginia 10th)

Barbara Comstock proved herself a viable candidate and formidable fundraising force, raking in more than $1.3 million in her successful bid for a seat from Virginia’s 10th District. Despite scrutiny over her conservatism, Comstock won endorsements from radio host Mark Levin and several PACs, including the American Conservative Union PAC, ShePAC, and Dominion Leadership Trust (Speaker of VA House of Delegates Bill Howell’s PAC), which donated $7,500 to her campaign.

As a spokesperson, lobbyist, political consultant, and founding partner of the public policy and public relations firm Corallo Comstock, she has worked for a number of high-powered clients, including the Recording Industry Association of America, Comcast, Koch Industries, and Chiquita Bananas. Comstock constructed an impressive network of high-level donors – only seven percent of her campaign donors gave small contributions; 54 percent gave large amounts.

Comstock expanded her donor base by mobilizing major heavyweights in the Republican Party. Mother Jones reported, “Her fundraising filings look like a roster of Republican convention speakers,” including former governors, congressmen, and several members of the Bush administration. Mitt Romney hosted a fundraiser for her first delegate campaign and headlined a fundraiser for her in September 2014. Comstock cleared the common primary hurdles for female GOP candidates by leveraging her networks and reeling in big donors. While there remains a lack of institutional support for Republican women outside the party structure, Comstock filled a funding void by creating her own infrastructure, built from relationships forged with clients and Republican powerbrokers.
Women’s PACs

Female Democratic candidates (particularly the large majority who are pro-choice) have another advantage through the liberal PAC EMILY’s List. Our analysis of Republican women’s fundraising groups suggests that the presence of EMILY’s List – and the absence of a comparable entity on the GOP side – is a serious structural deficit for female Republican candidates. EMILY’s List provides direct support for pro-choice female Democratic candidates and serves as a strong “stamp of approval” that helps endorsed candidates leverage other funding.

While there are several PACs that raise money for Republican women, such as Maggie’s List, and VIEW PAC, none has the size or stature to serve this same function for female GOP candidates. Also, conservative women’s PACs don’t often fund in primaries, particularly contested ones, mirroring party practice.

Furthermore, Democratic donors are familiar with EMILY’s List and its work to recruit, train, and fund candidates. The 2014 National Supporters Survey found that 93 percent of Democratic Party donors had heard of EMILY’s List, and 95 percent of pro-choice PAC donors were familiar with the group. For Democratic (and other progressive PAC) donors, an EMILY’s List endorsement signals that a candidate is credible, electorally viable, and worthy of funding.

Republican Party donors, however, are not familiar with the pro-life and conservative women’s PACs in our survey, or their party’s efforts to recruit female candidates. Susan B. Anthony List, which endorses pro-life congressional candidates, is most familiar to GOP donors. Yet nearly 4 in 10 donors (37 percent) have never heard of the group. Conservative women’s PACs are nearly unknown; more than 90 percent of Republican Party donors have never heard of either ShePAC (91 percent) or VIEW PAC (95 percent), and 3 in 4 donors didn’t know of Maggie’s List (77 percent). Fewer than 2 in 10 donors are aware of the National Republican Congressional Committee’s Project GROW (Growing Republican Opportunities for Women), an initiative to recruit and fund female Republican House candidates.
The varying visibility of women’s PACs holds important ramifications for how these groups motivate members and grow their donor bases. These committees benefit when their members believe the group meets a critical need ignored in the current political landscape. The underrepresentation of women in politics is a compelling catalyst for funders on the Democratic side, but not as strong on the Republican side. Donors who contribute to pro-choice women’s PACs or the Democratic Party are likely to agree that women are excluded from leadership roles and/or denied opportunities for political participation.

In the National Supporters Survey, 62 percent of donors to Democratic women’s PACs and 61 percent of donors to the Democratic Party agreed that “women’s underrepresentation is a product of fewer opportunities.” Yet only 11 percent of Republican Party donors agreed that women have fewer opportunities in politics; 23 percent of donors to pro-life or conservative women’s PACs agreed.

The limited awareness of conservative women’s PACs among Republican donors holds important consequences. An endorsement by a conservative women’s PAC does not elicit the same funding signals to Republican funders as an endorsement by a liberal women’s PAC does to Democratic donors. Conservative women’s PACs that are unknown to Republican donors have a difficult time establishing themselves as valued partners in the party’s efforts to attract and support female candidates.
According to founder Ellen Malcolm, EMILY’s List was expressly created to develop a network of women donors who would provide early funding to competitive, progressive, female congressional candidates. As such, the vast majority of donors who contribute to the PAC are female. The number of male and female donors to the Democratic and Republican Parties, as well as conservative women’s PACs and pro-life PACs is less gendered. Men are the primary donors to all political campaigns regardless of party or candidate gender.

Given that donors generally view male and female candidates the same in terms of preferred qualities, all PACs should promote endorsed women candidates to their respective donor bases.

A majority of donors in all groups consider male and female candidates from their political party similarly qualified to hold office, competitive, good at fundraising, and appealing to voters.

Both parties and women’s PACs have opportunities to grow by targeting prospective women donors and drawing attention to efforts to recruit and fund female candidates. PACs can emphasize a candidate’s position on issues of high salience to donors and voters. For Republican and conservative women’s PAC donors, the issue of greatest importance is limiting the size and scope of government, which eclipses all other issues, including national defense, tax policy, and social issues like same-sex marriage and abortion. To energize donors, women’s PACs can highlight how candidates prioritize these causes, and encourage donors to earmark funds to female candidates, common practices for EMILY’s List and Susan B. Anthony List.
While the GOP is focusing more today on electing women, recruitment and candidate development aren't prioritized enough to move the needle on female representation, even though doing so could attract voters, engage minorities, and change public perceptions of the party from an “old boys club” to a more inclusive institution.

Democrats have recently outpaced Republicans in nominating women for office. In 2014, twice as many female Democrats as female Republicans ran in House, Senate, and governors’ races. And despite several historic wins for GOP women in the midterm election, men still account for 90 percent of Republicans in Congress. (Yet interestingly, Republican women have recently outpaced Democratic women in winning governors’ seats.)

In general though, our qualitative interviews with elected Republican women and party leaders confirm that the GOP struggles to recruit, coach, and retain women. There’s no significant structure to shepherd female candidates through a primary election. And with little candidate development at the local level or explicit party engagement in primaries, Republicans aren’t establishing a pipeline of future federal officeholders.

“…We haven’t spent time developing a farm team. The Democrats have done a better job encouraging women to run for municipal and state office, and it puts them in a position to run in congressional seats.”

Female Republican national party leader

Women are less likely to be interested in running for office and more reluctant than men to jump into the public eye.

“Guys instinctively say yes. It takes more energy to recruit a woman candidate than a male candidate. Women think more globally about how hard it will be on their family, their work. They think that through more deeply on the front end than most male candidates.”

Female Republican state party leader
Several current Republican congresswomen struggled with their decision to run:

“I spent a month talking to people...community leaders, party leaders, business leaders. Enough of them were supportive that I got into it. I recognized that it could be a great opportunity, but I did have mixed feelings. The most common question I get [from women considering running], especially if they have children, is how they can do it. The idea of being away from their families and missing that part of their lives is difficult.”

Republican congresswoman

Few women in top elective political positions have young children, regardless of party. And the average age of women in the House is higher than the average age for men, suggesting that women run later in life, perhaps after their children are grown. Male politicians with spouses who manage childcare and the household have an advantage.

Women are also harder to recruit than male candidates. They’re not asked to run as often, are less likely to be asked multiple times, and more likely to need intense recruitment. Party leaders surmise that fewer Republican women run for Congress because there aren’t many at the state or local levels willing and able to move up the ranks.

“I think there are more Democratic women who are active in the party and become local officeholders and move through the ranks. We don’t have enough of a bench.”

Republican congresswoman

Many stated that candidate development needs to be a focus. The Lugar Training Series and broader “Excellence in Public Service Series” (which includes programs in multiple states), provide women candidates with the skills and tools to manage a primary campaign. These programs are expanding, but aren’t yet national in scope.

“You need to find the right time to run for elected office. When people want to recruit candidates, they want them right now for a specific race and it doesn’t always work. Women are multitasking - taking care of children, working, volunteer obligations. You can have women running for the school board or something more manageable to get the experience and exposure to prep them to be available when something might come along later.”

Female Republican national party leader
There’s also an intense debate about whether gender matters in campaigns. Research affirms that women are different, and in some cases, better or more suitable candidates. One female national party leader said women candidates benefit from their “ability to communicate and connect with voters.”

Gender may not be the GOP’s driving factor in identifying candidates, but it’s recognized that women may be preferred under certain circumstances.

“Women for the most part were more willing to make the campaign less about them and more about the voter. They are more credible when it comes to talking to voters and talking on camera. They’re much stronger at delivering a message about the economy, which is the message of the last few cycles. People relate to them more…more family units know that women manage the finances in the home, so that’s easy to relate to. They’re concerned about their children, their family, and their health insurance premiums. It’s easier to develop messages and a campaign not around the candidate, but making sure we’re appealing to what the voter wants.”

Female Republican national party leader

MYTH VS REALITY

Candidate Quality and Experience

When it comes to recruiting and electing women, there’s speculation that Democrats sacrifice quality for quantity. Our quantitative data suggests this is a misperception. Although defining “high-quality” candidates is often a subjective enterprise, political science often uses previous political experience as a proxy for candidate quality. Campaign consultants confirm that having had some prior campaign experience can be a great benefit for a candidate. Ability to raise money to run is another oft-used measure. For both of these, our comparisons by party do not suggest that Democrats nominate or support women only for the sake of diversity – they find good candidates.

In examining the backgrounds of every female House candidate in the 2014 primaries, we found that Democratic women had no less previous political experience than Republican women. The Democratic women were also able to raise as much or more money than their female Republican counterparts.

Republicans must continue to seek, identify, and recruit women. Looking further down the pipeline that leads to Congress, there are scores of Republican women in state legislatures and serving on city councils or as other elected officials, who aren’t running for Congress. Republican women face higher hurdles in a primary race, and may perceive a potential run as an uphill battle, which keeps good candidates from running.
As Republican women fall farther behind in Congress, another major hurdle prevents their progress. In the past two decades, Americans, and the candidates and elected officials seeking to represent them, have diverged sharply in ideology; conservatives are growing more conservative and liberals more liberal.

Women are often perceived to be more moderate politicians than men. But the female Republican candidates we studied were just as conservative as their male counterparts (Democratic women were somewhat more liberal than Democratic men). Looking at ideology scores for the more than 10,000 candidates for Congress between 1990 and 2010, we found no significant differences by gender among Republicans, who have on average become more conservative in that time period, as Democrats have on average become more liberal. Our quantitative data analyses suggest the more conservative candidate usually wins the Republican primary and the more liberal candidate wins among Democrats. With a shift toward the far right among the Republican electorate, particularly primary voters, GOP women struggle to overcome the perception that they’re more moderate.

*Average Ideology of Male and Female House Primary Candidates, 1990-2010*

“They’re (special interest groups) likely to not support the candidate who will be the strongest in the general. They’re going for a candidate who says they’re anti-leadership or will create chaos in Washington, rather than someone who will be productive. You don’t often see a woman who wants to completely disrupt the place — they might want to shake it up — but it makes it hard for a woman to garner that far right third party group.”

Female Republican national party leader
In the wider American public, however, there remains an ideological gender gap among those who identify as Republicans or independents, but lean Republican. Some, like political scientist Danielle Thomsen, suggest that part of the discrepancy comes from the lack of moderate female candidates running for office. In data collected for this project regarding candidates’ changing ideology, it’s evident that more conservative Republican women are running in primaries than moderate Republican women.

While candidates have diverged ideologically, a substantial number of voters still fall in the moderate-centrist camp. In the 2014 Pew Study on the American electorate, 39 percent surveyed (the plurality) identified themselves as ‘mixed’ in their political views.

![American Electorate Ideology (2014)](image)

Similarly, in a 2014 Gallup survey, 35 percent identified as moderate. More than one third of the electorate is at the center, and this group is less politically engaged than those at the ideological poles, who consistently vote conservative or liberal. For Republicans to capture new voters, they must reach out to the moderate third of the electorate with candidates who have varied ideological perspectives.

“I think there is a difference between what a primary voter is looking for and what a general election voter is looking for. Primary voters tend to be male, white. There are more married women. The general electorate is more diverse and includes more single women. It may be harder for some people to get through the primary, but they might be more successful and a stronger general election candidate.”

Female Republican state leader
The term “conservative” also means how primary voters view the world, and often includes such things as the appropriate role for women in society. Republican congresswomen comment on the challenge of breaking through some of these misperceptions.

“In some conservative areas of the country you have to battle and prove yourself to a male population. There’s a pretty intense feeling when they’ve never been represented by a female. Just listening to voices in the street…can I get through a primary as a woman?”

Republican congresswoman

“What frustrates me is that people say, “She has kids. Can she manage this?” A lot of men have kids at home and it doesn’t cross their mind. This whole ‘Can she manage being a wife, mother and an elected official?’ We never care about men in that way.”

Female Republican state party leader

There’s an assumption that older white men, who constitute a large portion of Republican primary voters, prefer candidates who “look like them.” This, some believe, creates a structural advantage for male candidates in a Republican primary.

“I don’t think it’s deliberate, but across the board most primary voters are old, white men. There’s a structural advantage to male candidates who look like the primary electorate. But, if you have a capable, articulate female candidate, I don’t think the structural difficulty is so strong that candidates can’t be successful.”

Male Republican national party leader
Our survey data suggest that there is some truth behind this assumption, particularly for older men and those in the South, who show a slight preference for men as candidates (as do older independents).

![Bar chart showing preferences for male or female candidates among Republicans](chart.png)

Do you/your spouse/your friends prefer a male or female candidate if all other qualifications appear equal? (Among Republicans)

Republican men in particular were more likely than other subgroups in the sample to say that female candidates are “emotional,” and that men are “better suited emotionally” for politics. This was not true of independents, however, who were more likely to say that women as candidates were more “compassionate.” Both Republicans and independents rated women as more likely to be “honest,” which is a quality all voters prize in a candidate. Both Republicans and independents thought female candidates would be better on “women’s issues,” but gave male candidates the advantage on issues of defense and national security.

Our research indicates that female Democratic candidates have a slight gender advantage, as Democrats view greater diversity in public office as an important goal. Democratic women are especially eager to see more women elected (part of the impetus behind the founding and success of EMILY’s List). Republican women in our survey show no such preference for women candidates, but also don’t prefer male candidates. On the whole, three in four independent voters say that gender doesn’t matter in a candidate. However, a quarter of independents, however, prefer women candidates over men by a 2-to-1 margin.
CASE STUDY
Joni Ernst (US Senate Iowa)

In a memorable television ad, GOP candidate Joni Ernst proclaimed, “I grew up castrating hogs on an Iowa farm, so in Washington, I’ll know how to cut pork.” This quip propelled her from a relative unknown junior state senator to a top contender in the Republican primary race for US Senate. Before Ernst’s November 2014 win, Iowa was one of only four states that had never sent a woman to Congress. Ernst captured 56 percent of the primary vote, successfully presenting herself as a strong conservative to Iowa’s primary electorate, which is typically more conservative than the state’s general electorate.

Ernst’s role as a mother and grandmother was central in her campaign. With the slogan “Mother, Soldier, Conservative,” she fulfilled traditional role expectations often held by conservative voters. Another television ad showed her riding a Harley-Davidson to a gun range, aiming her 9mm toward the camera, declaring, “I’ll take aim at wasteful spending and unload on Obamacare.” This solidified her support of the second amendment and as a champion of limited government. She drew major financial backing from conservative PACs, garnering the endorsement of many heavy hitters in the Republican Party such as Senator Marco Rubio, Sarah Palin, the Tea Party Express, and Mitt Romney. Senator Rubio’s PAC directed $243,000 toward Ernst’s primary bid. In the final week of the primary, PACs spent a total of $700,000 supporting her – almost unheard of for female Republican primary candidates.

Ernst benefited by appealing to a conservative electorate and convincing major donors of her viability as a candidate. She hired experienced campaign strategists and fundraisers, many of whom worked on Romney’s 2012 campaign. Their expertise enabled her to raise significant money and develop a campaign strategy that reached every corner of the state (she received donations from every county in Iowa and from all 50 states).

“When we have a high-quality leader running, there needs to be a commitment to get her through the primary. We’ve always adopted a hands-off approach. There’s growing recognition that we can’t sit out primaries.”

Republican congresswoman
Gaining Ground

With GOP women far behind both Republican men and Democratic women in elected office, they won’t gain ground without concerted effort on their behalf. As we explore the barriers that prevent women’s ascent to high-level office, we’re also developing effective, research-based strategies that can unite actors and allies to dramatically increase women’s representation. To clear the hurdles of Infrastructure, Inattention, and Ideology, and help more Republican women succeed in primaries, we suggest focusing on three core tenets for change:

**RECRUITMENT**
Build a pipeline and a path

**DEVELOPMENT**
Steward and support future leaders

**COLLABORATION**
Unite and engage the party, PACs, and donors

**RECRUITMENT**

As evidenced by the fact that in 2014, twice as many female Democrats as female Republicans ran in House, Senate, and governors’ races, there simply aren’t enough GOP women on the ballot or the bench. Without GOP committees, organizations, and donors prioritizing the elevation of women’s political leadership at all levels, we will never reach a truly reflective democracy. GOP women need to be asked, encouraged, trained, and supported to run and win a primary election.

Based on our previous research, the number one reason women run for higher office, particularly Republican women, is to change the way government works. But they need to be encouraged to run.

To accelerate the recruitment of qualified female candidates, the GOP can:

- Look beyond the informal male networks that typically recruit male candidates;
- Invite women into the inner circle of the Republican Party to develop policy experience and profiles as a head start for future races;
- Map potential resources and open seats, matching candidates to districts where women are more likely to succeed, particularly in states with strong infrastructure, a history of women’s representation, and where multiple women currently serve in high-level office;
- Engage political mentors — especially current or former elected or party officials — who are instrumental in inspiring women to run; and
- Encourage current female Republican officeholders to work with parties, recruiters, and political groups on succession-planning, ensuring more women follow their path.

---

Intensifying the recruitment of qualified candidates and bolstering the bench will allow the GOP to run more women. Demographic shifts are reshaping the American electorate, making it more racially diverse and younger, trends that favor Democrats. And while many candidates and voters have diverged ideologically, more than one third of the public is in the moderate center.

For the GOP to compete, the party must diversify its candidate pool, engage minorities and moderates, and put women on the ticket.

With more female officeholders, it’s easy for Democrats to project the notion that their party prioritizes, listens to, and supports women. Increasing the number of female Republican legislators could quell the “War on Women” rhetoric and attract more women, minorities, and young people to the party. Recruiting and running female candidates with varied ideological perspectives is essential to engaging centrists.

While gender is not the GOP’s driving factor in identifying candidates, our research indicates that in some cases, both male and female voters may actually prefer women. In an 800-person, dual-sample national survey, we asked both Republicans and independents for their perceptions about women, politics, policies, and political parties. We were interested in comparing the viewpoints of both groups, with an eye toward opportunities for the Republican Party. More voters are identifying as independents, and both parties could benefit from capturing this swing vote. Independents rated Democrats and Republicans about the same on an “image thermometer,” suggesting the GOP can gain ground with this electorate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermometer Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Perceptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: POS Survey Data*
Interestingly, our data also indicates that independents are somewhat more likely to prefer female candidates over men (although most say they are gender-neutral). While most voters claim gender makes little difference, twice as many independents said they prefer a generic female candidate to a generic male. (Many independents seemed to think that their friends would still prefer a male candidate, perhaps somewhat overestimating the amount of continuing sexism in the electoral environment, or underestimating their own feelings on the issue.)

When you look at the qualities women bring, many are qualities that people all across this country are seeking. Quite often they are better listeners, work across the aisle, and are problem solvers.”

Republican congresswoman
Far more than gender, voters care about personal qualities, including whether or not a candidate is “honest” and “a problem solver.” For Republicans, honesty is the most important candidate quality. For independents, who appear less engaged with the political process than party members, honesty was very important, but being a bipartisan “problem solver” was most essential.

### Most important qualities or values when choosing a candidate for public office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities/Values</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest, someone who does what he or she says they will do once in office</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solver, someone who works with Democrats and Republicans to get things done</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family values, someone who reflects good Christian values while in office</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward, someone who tells it like it is</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, someone willing to stand up to his or her party if they disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic, someone who truly loves this country</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For people, someone who always puts people, not corporations, first</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From representative national sample of 800 likely voters

Source: POS Survey Data

Both Republican and independent voters said that women candidates are preferable on both qualities. Female voters in particular said that women candidates have an edge over men in “keeping government honest” and “working out compromises.”

### Candidate attributes ranked “More true of women.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Republicans Polled</th>
<th>Independents Polled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representing the interests of women</td>
<td>61% More True of Women</td>
<td>62% More True of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working out compromises</td>
<td>28% More True of Women</td>
<td>35% More True of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with issues such as education and health care</td>
<td>21% More True of Men</td>
<td>24% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping government honest</td>
<td>14% More True of Women</td>
<td>23% More True of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to the needs of constituents</td>
<td>12% More True of Women</td>
<td>13% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up for what they believe in, despite political pressure</td>
<td>12% More True of Women</td>
<td>20% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing the interests of people like you</td>
<td>7% More True of Men</td>
<td>15% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with crime and public safety</td>
<td>3% More True of Men</td>
<td>6% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with national security and defense</td>
<td>2% More True of Women</td>
<td>1% More True of Men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From representative national sample of 800 likely voters

Source: POS Survey Data
DEVELOPMENT

There are scores of Republican women serving in state legislatures, on city councils, or in other elected positions. Yet few are running for Congress. With higher primary hurdles, GOP women may perceive a potential run as an uphill battle and stay on the sidelines. Long before deciding whether or not to run, women need training that focuses on the varying levels of political office, how to manage a campaign, build networks, fundraise, and engage donors and voters.

According to our previous research, for the vast majority of female candidates, fundraising is the biggest perceived barrier to running for higher office. Asking for money is a learned skill. Women need to know it’s not impossible, and parties and other powerbrokers can help by providing access to donor lists, networks, and training.

Female candidates raise just as much money as men in comparable races, even if they have to ask more and work harder than male candidates to raise the same amount.

Just as they would benefit from more tailored and consistent coaching, female candidates can learn from and engage experienced campaign staff. Women often rely upon a “kitchen cabinet” — consisting of their spouses or friends — to run their races. While some state and local offices are winnable through small-scale campaigns managed by the candidate and a few volunteers, this is not the case when running for higher office.

Along with intensive recruitment, specialized training, and a knowledgeable team, female candidates require inspiration and encouragement. With so few GOP women in elected office, there are fewer mentors to guide a new generation. Republican women need community and national leaders (political and professional, male and female) who encourage young women, candidates, and elected leaders to get involved, stay involved, and ascend to high-level office.

These sponsors or political colleagues can champion and support a candidate’s journey from campaign to Congress. GOP political leaders can explain the nuts and bolts of public service, from raising funds to raising issues to raising children while in office.

Expanded mentorship across levels is essential to building the relationships women need to advance through the political ranks. Young elected officials and congressional staffers, in particular, would benefit from deeper professional relationships with experienced female officeholders. What’s needed most is infrastructure to organize meaningful mentorship; outside groups, such as women’s political organizations, can fill this role.
COLLABORATION

The absence of a well-known, conservative committee, or other well-financed early funding streams dedicated to electing women, puts female Republican candidates at a severe disadvantage. Working together, women’s PACs can broaden their memberships and create the infrastructure necessary to provide specialized training and build fundraising networks for electing candidates, retaining GOP officeholders, and transitioning more Republican women to higher office.

We noted the significant role EMILY’s List has played increasing the ranks of Democratic women in Congress over the last three decades. Interestingly, the PAC was expressly created to develop a network of women donors who would provide early funding to competitive, progressive, female Congressional candidates. As such, the vast majority of donors who contribute to the committee are female.

Most women don’t consider political giving a worthwhile investment, nor do they associate supporting female candidates with advancing issues of importance to them or increasing women’s representation overall. They account for only a quarter of all political contributions; men are the primary donors to all political campaigns. Conservative women donors need to understand the importance and benefits (to their party and the country) of supporting female candidates.

Republican PACs can grow by targeting prospective women donors and encouraging them to support recruitment efforts and provide early funding for female candidates. Committees should emphasize a candidate’s position on issues of high salience to donors and voters. For GOP and conservative women’s supporters, these include limiting the size and scope of government. PACs and conservative groups can also provide opportunities for women donors to meet or campaign with female candidates, nurturing philanthropic and political partnerships.

Running for high-level office is difficult for any candidate, but Republican women face higher hurdles. We can even the field for GOP women and build a more reflective democracy by clearing these barriers. Women need to be asked (multiple times), encouraged, coached, and supported to win primary elections. The GOP must prioritize female candidate recruitment and development, as well as educate donors and voters about the benefits of electing women. Conservative women’s PACs can coordinate efforts to engage their memberships and inspire a new generation of female Republican leaders.

Some predict we’ll be colonizing the moon before we reach gender parity. One thing is certain: We’ll never get to 50 percent without elevating women on all sides of the aisle. Concerted, collaborative prioritization of female representation can get more Republican women in the race and America back on track — potentially within election cycles, rather than centuries.

“Our opponents have attempted to define us as only being about a segment of the population — only wealthy, white male — and that’s not accurate. It’s very important we set the record straight. Republicans represent every background. Women are an important part of that.”

Republican congresswoman
We can even the field for GOP women and build a more reflective democracy by clearing the primary hurdles
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